

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 3, and 9 are currently amended. Claims 19 and 20 have been newly added. No claims have been canceled.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Office Action references claims 1, 2, 3, and 9 as being indefinite or lacking antecedent basis. The Examiner is thanked for a careful, detailed review of the claims. Further, the Examiner is thanked for detailing the rejections in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 3, and 9 in response to the Examiner's comments.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is now moot and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn for claims 1-18.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,850,255 issued to Muschetto (herein "Muschetto"). Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 in response to this rejection and respectfully submit that Muschetto does not anticipate Applicants' invention.

Muschetto is directed toward a user interface with four panels, which are "always visible and accessible." See Muschetto abstract. Among one of the four panels is a "hierarchal containment system" which is used to group "people, places, things and home" which a "user would seek to utilize within the GUI [graphical user interface]." *Id.* Muschetto utilizes the same four panels "within multiple computer devices, even though the designs of those devices may include a wide range of display and control systems," which provides a level of "consistency

across various computing devices.” *Id.* Thus, Muschetto is directed at applying a *consistent* user experience across multiple devices to enhance usability and user satisfaction.

The Office Action cites to Muschetto’s figures 2, 3, 4, 17, and 18 along with the related passages of the specification. However, Muschetto fails to disclose “ordering each of the plurality of sets of user interface elements into an sequence *within an archive file*” (emphasis added) as stated in Applicants’ currently amended claim 1. Muschetto is focused on providing a *consistent* user experience across devices and allowing users to group “people, places, things, and home” in a hierarchal containment system. Examiner notes that one such hierarchal containment system is shown in Muschetto’s figure 5 (left-hand side). Thus, Muschetto is focused on visually representing a hierarchy in a consistent manner.

In contrast, Applicants invention is directed at “ordering each of the plurality of user interface elements into a sequence *within an archive file*” (emphasis added), which relates to the organization of the user interface element in memory, *not* the visual representation of the user interface elements. Further, Applicants invention provides the ability to generate a *customized* user interface (compared with Muschetto’s *consistent* user interface). The purpose of providing the user interface elements “within an archive file” as claimed in claim 1 is to allow applications to each “supply their own application-specific archive file that masks some of the resources in the common archive file and adds further resources that are required.” *See* Applicants’ paragraph 45. Thus, in the real world, where different manufacturers come together to design a device (e.g., a mobile network operator, a device manufacturer, and a device’s own user), later added user interface elements within archive files could *customize* the user interface. *See* Applicants’ paragraph 46. Muschetto provides no disclosure to enable a mobile network operator or user to add an archive file to the device to order “each of the plurality of user interface elements into a

sequence within an archive file” to create a *customized* user interface. In sharp contrast, Muschetto discloses a *consistent* user interface across multiple devices.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Muschetto fails to disclose “ordering each of the plurality of user interface elements into a sequence *within an archive file*” as claimed in Applicants’ currently amended claim 1. Further, claim 9 has been similarly amended. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 9 are patentable over Muschetto and respectfully request allowance.

Dependent claims 2-8 and 10-18 are dependent on claims 1 and 9 and incorporate all the limitations of claims 1 and 9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8 and 10-18 are allowable over Muschetto and respectfully request allowance.

Newly Added Claims

Claims 19 and 20 are newly added. Claim 19 is directed toward a computer-readable medium *i.e.* a Beauregard claim. Claim 20 is directed toward a device which is claimed using means-plus-function claim language as provided under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. Applicants submit that claims 19 and 20 incorporate the same limitations as claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19 and 20 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request allowance of claims 19 and 20.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated August 10, 2009

By: 

Nicholas A. Cole
Reg. No. 60/958
(858) 6578-1834

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-1834
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502